



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lower than Jewish law, which is also continental law, and generally also the law of Scotland. Something should be done by our Rabbinical authorities to meet the difficulty of a husband divorced by the civil law refusing to give the Get to his former wife. This is no fault of the Jewish law, but the difficulty arises from our own want of jurisdiction.

Putting this aside, it does not seem advisable to abolish the Get, and it is logical that the Synagogue, which insists upon marriage between Jews being performed in accordance with Jewish rites, should also insist upon the divorce being performed in accordance with the same rites. The book of Mr. Amram will be useful, by its clearness and impartiality, in throwing light upon a difficult question. That it should have been written in America is a proof of a much stronger conservative spirit in American Judaism than we generally gave it credit for.

L. M. SIMMONS.

DR. MALTER ON AL-GAZZÂLÎ.

Die Abhandlung des Abû Hâmid Al-Gazzâlî: Antworten auf Fragen die an ihn gerichtet wurden, von DR. HEINRICH MALTER. Frankfurt a. M.: J. Kauffmann. 1896.

THERE is no more interesting personage in the history of Arabic, or, more exactly, of Moslem, thought, than Al-Gazzâlî, who gained the names of Hagġat ul-Islâm (Proof of Islam), Zain ad-din (Ornament of religion). He was born in the Khorassan in the year 1058, and died in 1111. He was director of the Nizamiyya College at Bagdad. He gave up his chair to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, and then taught at Damascus, at Jerusalem, and at Alexandria. He retired to Tus, his birthplace, and became in the end a member of the mystic sect of the Sufites, and composed there his celebrated works, the aim of which was to prove that Islam was superior to all other religions, to all systems of philosophy.

Even before the Abbasids had ascended the throne at Bagdad, and the Caliph Al-Mamoun had put forth efforts to propagate the science of Greece amongst the Arabs, Moslems had begun to think on the problems of theology. But it was from the rise of the Motazzilites at Basra that attempts were made to reconcile philosophy, especially the philosophy of Aristotle, with the truths of Islam. The names of Al-Kendi, Al-Farabi, and Avicenna at once occur to us. Al-Gazzâlî, however, was not a reconciler of Islam and philosophy. His aim was

to show that philosophy was not to be relied upon, that her supposed truths crumbled away when they were examined, and that in the end all we could know of the meaning of life was given us by revealed religion. His two works which treat of the contradictions of philosophy bear the names of *Al-Magaşid*, or "The Tendencies," and the *Taháfut Al-Fulâsafa*, "The Destruction of Philosophers." They attempted, perhaps unconsciously, to found belief upon unbelief. Philosophically, Gazzâlî was a sceptic, and probably he is best known in the history of thought by his analysis of cause and effect. He says that there is no necessary connexion of cause between things which occur habitually together. If there seems to be a connexion it is only because the divine mind has ordered that the one should always occur after the other. It is a divinely ordained habitual sequence, but there is no causal connexion, no law of nature, so that we can say it must be that a so-called effect must have a so-called cause. This is approaching Berkeley's theory of causation. It is not the theory of Hume, because Hume would have rejected any reference to the divine mind. At any rate, on that point he would have been decidedly Agnostic.

For Jews and students of Judaism, the influence of Gazzâlî upon Jewish philosophy is of deep interest. Dr. Joel, in his work on Don Chasdai Kreskas, compares the method of Kreskas to that of Gazzâlî, but is not inclined to place the indebtedness of Kreskas to Gazzâlî very high. Dr. Kaufmann, in his *Attributenlehre*, states how deeply Jehudah Hallevi in his *Kusari* was affected by Gazzâlî, and in many cases how he took bodily whole passages from the Moslem philosopher. But neither Al-Gazzâlî nor Jehudah Hallevi thought that a doctrine was true because it was absurd. Both wished for a reasonable religion, but each thought that Islam and Judaism respectively should teach its own truths without being incommoded by extraneous teachings.

Probably Al-Gazzâlî's most important theological work, at any rate his most popular, was his *Ihja'ulum ad-din*, "The Revival of Religious Knowledge." The extracts from it which lie before me are evidences of a religious spirit, and many of his sayings and quotations are truly spiritual, and prove that an ethical Islam is no contradiction, and that Islam, when rightly understood, is a true guide for conduct to those who would follow her. It is sometimes said that it is especially the teaching of Christianity that he who loses his life gains his life. Al-Gazzâlî quotes with approval the following saying of Moslem teachers: "The joy of heaven is only gained by him who is ready to give up the joys of earth." The education of the soul is compared to the weaning of an infant child. Of divorcing a wife he says that of all man's free acts it is the one most hateful in the sight of God.

What he says of metaphysics or religious philosophy is highly characteristic : "Metaphysics are necessary on account of the fancies of the men of our days, just in the same way as pilgrims to Mecca need protection from the Bedouin robbers. If the Arabs ceased from their attacks, the pilgrims would need no guard ; and so, in the same way, if men gave up their new fancies, we should no longer require theology, for theology is not needed in an age of belief, such as the age of the companions of the prophet. But theology should know its limits, and bear in mind that its position to religion is that of a guard to the pilgrims on the road to Mecca." According to Gazzâlî, theology is a *pis-aller* or a necessary evil in an age of scepticism.

How far was Al-Gazzâlî serious ? Was he really a philosophical sceptic, or did he believe in philosophy and teach metaphysics to an inner circle ? This question has often been discussed, and the object of the work of Dr. Malter is to throw light on the question. At the end of some manuscripts of the Hebrew translation of the *Tahâfat*, a little work is added in which Al-Gazzâlî treats in obscure language some important philosophical questions. This work bears, through Moses Narboni, who translated the *Tahâfat*, the title כוונת הכוונות, "The Tendency of the Tendencies," and therefore seems to be intended as a supplement to Gazzâlî's own *Maqasid*. Dr. Malter restores the Hebrew text, and in his first part refers the work to its sources, either in Gazzâlî's own *Maqasid*, or in the astronomical work of Al-Ferganis, adding the Arabic text, and giving a German translation. In the second part he restores the Hebrew text, and refers simply to the *Maqasid*. In each part valuable notes are given. Dr. Malter, who is a pupil of Dr. Steinschneider, tells us that he has prepared a complete edition of the *Maqasid*. We trust that it may soon be published.

Dr. Malter decides the question of consistency or sincerity against Al-Gazzâlî. This is the generally received opinion. Averroes, who wrote against Gazzâlî's *Tahâfat* in the treatise *Tahâfat al-Tahâfat*, "Destruction of Destruction," accuses him of being an Asharite with the Asharites, a Sufi with the Sufites, a philosopher with the philosophers. Gazzâlî, speaking of the work which is assumed to be his, says at the end of it : "This work is to be communicated to those only who have a right mind and sound intelligence, in conformity with the maxim, 'Speak to men according to their intelligence.'" Ibn Tofail says of Al-Gazzâlî, in his well-known philosophical romance of *Hai ibn Yaqdan*, which has been translated into more than one European language, and is perhaps best known in Pococke's translation, which bears the name of *Philosophus autodidactus*, that "he now binds and then loosens, now denies certain things and then declares them to be

true." Al-Gazzālī's character and position in Moslem thought are most interesting. He was more original than Jehudah Hallevi, but no one has ever doubted our Jewish poet-philosopher's truthfulness of heart.

L. M. SIMMONS.

GRÜNBAUM'S JUDEO-SPANISH CHRESTOMATHY.

Judeo-Spanish Chrestomathy, by M. GRÜNBAUM. Frankfurt a. M.: J. Kauffmann. 1896 (160 pp.).

M. R. FOULCHÉ-DELBOSC has opened the *Revue Hispanique*, edited by him, with a very interesting essay, entitled, *La Transcription Hispano-Hébraïque* (*Revue Hispanique*, Paris, 1894, i. 23 sqq.), which, it seems, was unknown to the author of the above-named book. If he had known it, his labour would have been less difficult, and he might have been induced besides, not to confine himself in his introduction to a discussion of the characteristic differences only between German-Jewish and Spanish-Jewish, but also to deal more fully with the peculiarities and the character of the latter dialect or of the *Ladino*. The *Ladino*, often called also *lengua castellana*, or *idioma español*, is an invaluable source for the investigation of the Old-Spanish language, and has, hitherto, not been made sufficient use of for this purpose. It is distinguished from Spanish or Castilian by the great number of Old-Spanish words and forms, which were still current at the time of the expulsion of the Jews from Spanish territory. Thus we find in the *Ladino* most frequently *m* for *n*, as *muestrós*, *mos*, for *nuestrós*, *nos*; *n* for *m*, as *tiempo* for *tiempo*, *compañia* for *compañia*; the inserted *n*, *conplas* for *coplas*; the transposition of *d* and *r*, as *redrad* for *verdad*, *acodro* for *acordo*, *pedrer* for *perder*; the prefixing of an *a* before verbs and other words, *aconjurar* for *conjurar*, *arobar* for *robar*, *afuera* for *fuera*; the use of *f* instead of *h*, as *facer* for *hacer*, *fasta* for *hasta*. The *Ladino* has often *pr*; thus *probre* for *pobre*, *presona* for *persona*, *probeza* for *pobreza*. The *Ladino* does not as a rule double the consonants; טײַרר = *tierra*, קאַרײַרר = *carrera*, &c.

M. Grünbaum, who published also a *Chrestomathy* of German-Jewish about fourteen years ago, gives in his book extracts from Spanish-Jewish translations of the Bible, the prayer-books, the *Hagada* of Passover, the *Pirke-Aboth*; also from ethical and religious works, such as *Choboth-Halebaboth*, *Kav-Hayashar*, *Shevet-Mussar*, *Peli-Yoëtz*; from Almosnino's *Regimiento de la Vida*, from didactic and cabbalistical, humoristic and entertaining writings, from the pretty abundant periodical literature, &c. The only thing we miss in the